

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,701	08/28/2003	Atsushi Nagasawa	241985US0	6751
22850 75	0 7590 06/17/2005		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			OWENS, AMELIA A	
	DUKE STREET (ANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1625	
			DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/649,701	NAGASAWA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Amelia A. Owens	1625			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron tute, cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed  ys will be considered timely.  In the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04	4 March 2005.				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ T	his action is non-final.				
·— ··	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from <b>consideration</b> .				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cord 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		1			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document of: 2. Certified copies of the priority document of: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document of the prio	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applica priority documents have been received reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB. Paper No(s)/Mail Date					

fill

Application/Control Number: 10/649,701

Art Unit: 1625

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-23 are pending. Foreign priority is claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogino et al CA 135:363159 alone AND Ogino et al CA 134:282468 which teach a catalyst containing magnesium, zinc and aluminum used to prepare an alkylene oxide adduct by reacting an alkylene oxide and an activated H-bearing organic compound.

The difference between the claimed process and the prior art process is the particular reactants used and the product produced. Motivation arises as the claimed process is analogous to the prior art process. Use of a known member of a class of materials in a process is not patentable if other members of the class were known to be useful for that purpose. Here, note glycidyl ether is an alkylene oxide; the hydrogen containing compound language of the claim and prior art is broad enough to overlap; it is an addition reaction; the catalyst contains the same

Application/Control Number: 10/649,701

Art Unit: 1625

elements; Mg, Zn, Al; the product is the same, namely an alkylene oxide adduct. No unobvious or unexpected results are noted.

Regarding the compounds that have two(2) glycidyl ether adducts added, no more than routine skill is involved in adjusting the amount of a component of the process to suit a particular product in order to achieve the desired result. Again, no unobvious or unexpected results are noted.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for 'active hydrogen-containing organic compound is at least one selected from the group consisting of ethylene glycol, 1,2-propanediol, 1,3-propanediol, glycerin, pentaerythritol, diglycerin, polyglycerin, sorbitol, glucose, sucrose, glycerin ketal, and mixtures thereof', does not reasonably provide enablement for ---active hydrogen containing organic compound---. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

One should be able, from reading of the claims, determine what that claim does or does not encompass. Why? Because that claim preclude others from making, using, or selling that compound for 20 years. Therefore, one must know what compound is being claimed. The written description is considered inadequate here in the specification. Conception of the intended ---active hydrogen containing organic compound--- should not be the role of the reader.

Application/Control Number: 10/649,701

Art Unit: 1625

Applicant should, in return for a 20 year monopoly, be disclosing to the public that which they know as an actual demonstrated fact. The disclosure should not be merely and invitation to experiment. If you (the public) find that it works, I claim it, is not a proper basis of patentability.

One must first conceive of the ---active hydrogen containing organic compound---. Then one must, by preparing the compound himself, determine if the variables work or not. How can applicants regard as their invention inexact concepts? The breadth of which they could not have possibly check out with representative exemplification. The terms are not finite.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amelia A. Owens whose telephone number is 571-272-0690. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Amelia A. Owens **Primary Examiner**

Art Unit 1625